

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,134	01/25/2002	Satoshi Tazaki	020085	8160
23850	7590 03/29/2004		EXAM	INER
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP			DICUS, TAMRA	
1725 K STREI	ET. NW			
SUITE 1000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006		1774	1

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		T						
		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Communication		10/030,134	TAZAKI, SATOSHI					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Tamra L. Dicus	1774	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Pr Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence addre	<b>∋ss</b>				
THE I - External after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION mesions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta- reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma- aded patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R.1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the field will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC atute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this comm ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 December 2003</u> .							
2a) <u></u> □	, —	his action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allocalosed in accordance with the practice under			ierits is				
Disposit	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
,	ion Papers	,	8					
	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	,				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to							
441	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	·						
,—	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	a Office Action of form PTO	-152.				
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	aian muianitu umdan 25 H.C.C.	C 440(a) (d) an (5)					
* \$ 13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominice a specific reference was included in the 7 CFR 1.78.  2) The translation of the foreign language Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominice as a claim for dominice was included in the first sentence of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominice as a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the first sentence of the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for dominication of the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for dominication of the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for dominication of the first sentence of the priority document is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment is made of a claim for dominication of the foreign language acknowledgment language acknowledgment language acknowledgment language acknowledgment language acknowledgment language ackn	ents have been received. ents have been received in priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). list of the certified copies no estic priority under 35 U.S.C e first sentence of the specific provisional application has estic priority under 35 U.S.C	Application No  n received in this National Stot received.  S. § 119(e) (to a provisional a cation or in an Application Date been received.  S. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a second contraction or in the second contr	pplication) ata Sheet. specific				
Attachmen	at(s)	_						
2) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(	5) D Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). Informal Patent Application (PTO-1					

Application/Control Number: 10/030,134

Art Unit: 1774

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The claim objection is withdrawn due to Applicant's arguments. The 102(e) is withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over USPN 6,069,196 to Akao et al.

Akao teaches a molded article which is also a container body for a photographic film formed of a polyethylene resin composition and an alicyclic carboxylic acid amide compound of a divalent or polyvalent aliphatic amine, or a combination thereof (equivalent to an alicyclic structure-containing polymer) as in patented claim 12. The molded article contains an ink pattern as Akao expresses at col. 30, lines 22-28 stating the molded article may be provided with letters and marks with print (equivalent to ink layer of dots or lines) in order to improve the value as commercial goods. The ink used for printing them can be selected from harmless inks to photosensitive materials among conventional inks for offset printing, inks for gravure printing or UV inks. Akao continues to explain at col. 30, lines 28-56, the ink composition is of acrylic resins, meeting instant claim 5.

Application/Control Number: 10/030,134

Art Unit: 1774

At col. 14, lines 6-15, the ink functions as a light-shielding material by including inorganic pigments and metal powders. Such ink is a functional equivalent of the "light-reflecting" property as expressed in instant claim 6. See also col. 29, lines 40-45.

While Akao does not expressly disclose the retention selection subjected to tape peeling adhesion test having a value of at least 80% as recited in instant claim 1, it has been held that an element that is "being able to" perform a function (e.g. a 1-cm2 selection subjected to tape peeling adhesion) is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchinson*, 69 USPQ 138. Moreover, any property instantly claimed (e.g. peeling adhesion of at least 80% and index of wetting of at most 42 dyne/cm-instant claims 3 and 12) is an inherent property as the same materials are used, absent any evidence of the contrary.

- 4. Claims 4 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,069,196 to Akao et al. in view of USPN 5,437,926 to Takahashi et al.
- 5. Akao essentially teaches the claimed invention, as explained above. Akao does not teach the alicyclic structure being a norbornene polymer (claim 9), that it is a hydrogenated ring-opening polymer of a norbornene monomer (claim 10), composed of a tetracyclododecene or dicyclopentadiene (claim 11). However, Takahashi teaches a molded article having the aforementioned norbornene type polymer structure at col. 3, lines 30-45, col. 4, lines 1-55, col. 5, lines 5-10, and col. 8, lines 55-50. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the molded article of Akao to include a norbornene polymer of a dicyclopentadiene type polymer because

Art Unit: 1774

Takahashi teaches such polymers are used for molded or formed material making it possible to form a hard coat layer having greatly improved adhesion strength to a surface of thermoplastic saturated norbornene polymer molded article at col. 3, line 24-col. 4, line 50.

- 6. Akao does not teach an ink layer is at most 100 microns as instant claim 4. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to produce a thickness of an ink layer that is at most 100 microns, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272. Thickness of an ink layer effects the print quality.
- 7. Claims 1 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,069,196 to Akao et al. in view of JP Abstract 08-094852 to Hironobu.
- 8. Akao essentially teaches the claimed invention, as explained above. Akao does not teach the invention used a light guide for back light in a liquid crystal display (LCD). However, Hironobu teaches a light transmission plate for LCDs where the plate is of a thermoplastic norbornene based resin since the resin has high transparency, optical uniformity and excellent heat and moisture resistance as taught in the abstract of Hironobu. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the molded article of Akao to further use it as a light guide for LCDs since Hironobu teaches a suitable functional equivalent for the purpose of providing high transparency, optical uniformity and excellent heat and moisture resistance as taught in the abstract of Hironobu.

Application/Control Number: 10/030,134

Art Unit: 1774

## Response to Arguments

Page 5

- 10. Applicant's arguments filed 12-29-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues an alicyclic structure-containing polymer is not taught by Akao because alicyclic carboxylic acid does not polymerize. The Examiner does not agree. An alicyclic structure-containing polymer is indeed taught in patented claim 12 of Akao. The patented claim details a polyethylene resin composition including an alicyclic carboxylic acid. Therefore an alicyclic structure-containing polymer is included in the resin and reads on the instant claim as written.
- 11. Applicant argues no motivation exists to combine Akao and Takahashi because a hard coat layer of Takahashi is not a patterned ink layer as instant claim 1. The Applicant has not persuasively argued. Col. 3-4 and col. 5, lines 1-5 of Takahashi teaches a molding of the same alicyclic and norbornene polymer as instant claim 1 recites. Within the columns, Takahashi explains the structures are ring opening (esp. col. 4, lines 45) contrary to Applicant's argument.
- Applicant alleges Hironobu does not teach a light guide for back light or in combination with Akao appears to argue against substitution. Hironobu was not used to teach a substitution, but to teach the motivation for modifying the molding article of Akao to use the article as a light guide for LCDs since Hironobu teaches a suitable functional equivalent for the purpose of providing high transparency, optical uniformity and excellent heat and moisture resistance as taught in the abstract of Hironobu. To instant claim 7, the Examiner erroneously left out the number in the rejection statement, but addressed the claim limitations, therefore it is now included as set forth above.

Art Unit: 1774

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamra L. Dicus whose telephone number is 571-272-1519. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-4:30 p.m., alternate Fridays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 12, 2004

[tld]

CYCUTHUA H. KELLY
EUSPETTICOCO OCCUPAT EMANGINER
TRACIAL CALLER 1700

Cynth Kell